

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 7-10 are objected to because of the informality of the use of the word "and" instead of "as". Amended claims 4, 7-10 include the word "as" in the phrase "The device as in claim..."

Claims 1-4, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neel (U.S. Patent No. 1,540,801). Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cortez (U.S. Patent No. 3,512,561). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neel in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 4,227,557). Claims 5 and 6 are allowable if rewritten in independent form.


Amended claim 1 includes the limitation from claim 5 of requiring "a holding means to position said cutter so that its axis of rotation forms small acute angles to the axis of rotation of said article in both horizontal and vertical planes, said angles ranging between 3 and 9 degrees". Therefore the new limitation should overcome the prior art. Amended claim 6 has a changed dependency from the amended claim 1 and not the original claim 5, which is now canceled.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Boris Leschinsky, Applicants' Agent at 201-262-0051 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

6/20/05
Date


Boris Leschinsky
Agent for Applicant, Reg. No. 41404